

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION
Advisory Committee on Diversity
February 7th, 2001

San Diego Holiday Inn on the Bay (Pacific B Room)
1355 North Harbor Drive, San Diego, California

Attendance

Commissioners:

Sandra Gutierrez, Committee Co-Chair
Louis Vismara, M.D.

Committee Members:

Guadalupe Alonzo	Reinaldo Galindo	Irene Martinez	Diane Visencio
Brenda Blasingame	Javier Guzman	Patricia Phipps	Kate Warren
Portia S. Choi	Whitcomb Hayslip	Melanie Tervalon	Martin Waukazoo
Rafaela Frausto	Rafael Lopez	Sharon Tettegah	Maysee Yang

Welcome and Introduction

Dr. Louis Vismara began the meeting with welcoming remarks. Committee member introductions followed.

Approval of the November 6th, 2000 Minutes

Motion: It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2000 Commission meeting.

Membership and Leadership

Co-Chair Gutierrez offered welcoming remarks to the new members.

Co-Chair Gutierrez reported that Margaret Fortune is no longer with the State Commission and will no longer be Co-Chair of the Advisory Committee. Dr. Vismara's appointment to the position of Advisory Committee Co-Chair will be an action item at the next State Commission meeting.

The Committee voiced its support for Dr. Louis Vismara serving as Co-Chair of the Advisory Committee on Diversity.

Evaluation

Elias Lopez presented an overview of some of the State Commission's evaluation projects. The State Commission is proposing to conduct household surveys. The California Household Survey will ask questions relating to health access, health insurance, disability and childcare. The data set will include 55,000 households. Two other surveys not yet underway include a public opinion poll to assess public perception of available services and a survey to assess childcare and preschool access. The County Results and Indicators Project will provide information regarding programs and strategies employed by different counties. Leveraging assessments with respect to these programs are currently being addressed.

Javier Guzman spoke in support of the creation of the database, suggesting that it would help in solving problems at a fundamental level.

Elias Lopez encouraged the committee to provide input into the types of questions being address through these surveys.

Melanie Tervalon expressed concerns about the development of methodology. Dr. Tervalon asked for clarification on methodological aspects of the surveys. Dr. Lopez informed the committee that the family selection was done through random selection from a master list. Over sampling is required for certain populations.

Reinaldo Galindo asked if there was data to address the concept of regional economic hardship to school performance correlation. Dr. Lopez informed the committee that the data exists to examine such a correlation.

Sharon Tettegah asked why the random sampling method was chosen rather the blocking. Dr. Lopez informed the committee that this possibility is being considered.

The main objective of the Public Opinion survey is to assess what the perceived value by families and the general public of early childhood education and to assess which policy options they are willing to support.

Rafaela Frausto suggested the use of focus groups as a means of ascertaining needs of the community with respect to childcare.

Brenda Blasingame suggested examining survey methods other than using the telephone. Ms. Blasingame suggested that individual county commissions fund over sampling in their respective regions. Dr. Lopez informed the committee that he is currently assessing over sampling methodologies. Rafael Lopez echoed Ms. Blasingame's comments regarding the examination of alternative survey methods.

A discussion followed on the topic of the development of a committee to advise Elias Lopez on the further development of the surveys. The two existing survey concept papers will be distributed to the committee. Committee members were invited to submit ideas and comments to Elias Lopez through e-mail (with a copy to Barbara Marquez).

Elias Lopez introduced Oshi Rueles, the newest member of his research staff.

Public Comment

Karen Blinstrub, Santa Clara County, thanked Elias for his efforts in accommodating changes suggested by Santa Clara CFC. Ms. Blinstrub urged Elias to research the efforts of each of the county commissions with respect to existing databases.

Report on the State Commission Retreat (January 22, 2001)

Jane Henderson presented this discussion item. The State Commission examined the work it had done in the past year and addressed future issues in the context of where the Commission was presently. School Readiness has been adopted as an overarching goal. County commissions have shown support for this idea. The definition of school readiness is broad. It includes children's cognitive capacity, physical and health status and social and emotional development. The retreat also addressed what it means for the parents, the community and schools to be ready for school. The State Commission discussed at length how it should proceed with the advancement of school readiness. The Joint Legislative Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education has asked the State Commission to partner with them to address issues of pre-kindergarten child development. California is the first state to address pre-kindergarten issues in school readiness. Also discussed at the retreat was a school readiness initiative with the Governor. This is different but related to the Master Plan. The initiative specifically targets areas having low test scores, which have been found to be low income areas, and areas consisting predominantly of people of color. This body will be bolstered by a larger advisory body. This initiative shares the definition of school readiness adopted for the Master Plan component.

Co-Chair Gutierrez requested committee feedback on the concept of school readiness.

Portia Choi cautioned against making the initiative unnecessarily complicated. Dr. Choi points to the parents' responsibility for their children's readiness to learn as being a key component to the success of the child.

Patricia Phipps disagreed and suggested that parents need more support for their children in order to increase the likelihood of success.

Whitcomb Hayslip expressed concern about the reference to early childhood initiative as a school readiness initiative. Mr. Hayslip also identified the possibility of increased labeling of children as those having special needs through these initiatives.

It was suggested that schools offer support programs for parents to enable them to better help their children be ready for school.

Maysee Yang reported that she has found that her family resource center to be very effective and suggested that her school program could be used as a model.

Martin Waukazoo identified the need to examine this issue from other points of view. He cautioned against focusing solely on the child.

Rafael Lopez commented that it does not matter what the initiative is called, it is an opportunity to develop the concept of early childhood development. Mr. Lopez noted that Proposition 10 funds alone cannot solve all of the school readiness problems, but it does have the funds that can be leveraged to move other dollars to act in this area. He recognized the need to have specific recommendations for those who are making policy decisions.

Melanie Tervalon expressed concern over the research heavy nature of these initiatives. She suggested that the key to addressing these issues is the redistribution of resources.

Guadalupe Alonzo echoed Dr. Tervalon's comments and identified foster care children as being an under represented group in the arena of school readiness.

Javier Guzman identified the home as being an important learning institution and suggested increasing the focus on the home.

Rafaela Frausto echoed the comments of Javier Guzman with respect to the importance of the home in the development of children.

Sharon Tettegah recognized the need to address the needs of all children.

Rafael Lopez requested a time frame for the Advisory Committee to provide feedback on policy decisions before they are enacted.

Jane Henderson stated that reports on the initiatives would be available in late March.

Louis Vismara suggested the development of a matrix identifying where the two initiatives overlap.

Public Comment

Martin Chekel informed the committee of a new federal program called the Reading Access Act. Mr. Chekel spoke to the magnitude of some of the problems already identified.

Portia Choi commented that the church is also a place of learning.

A brief discussion followed on the topic of a child's first teacher. Children are entering into day care in their very early years.

Co-Chair Gutierrez spoke of a list that the State Commission was developing of ideas that may be considered for funding. She informed the committee that there was a space on that list where the committee could make some suggestions with respect to childcare.

Emily Nahat introduced Jennifer Bell, newest member of the CCFC Program Management Division. Ms. Bell was formerly coordinator for the Statewide System of School Support, a system that serves the highest poverty and lowest achieving schools in the state.

Advisory Committee on Diversity Planning Meeting

It was agreed that the retreat would be held on April 30th through May 1st. In addition, there would be another meeting on March 29th.

Louis Vismara asked if this body intends to generate something analogous to policy and procedures. Co-Chair Gutierrez informed the committee that the two things that it is committed to are reviewing and strengthening the guidelines and making recommendations of school readiness. Co-Chair Gutierrez asked for volunteers to document guidelines or tenets for the committee to submit to the State Commission to guide them in their projects.

Rafael Lopez asked that a working group have a draft for the March meeting. Guadalupe Alonzo, Patricia Phipps, Irene Martinez, Diane Visencio, Rafael Lopez and Kate Warren agreed to serve on the work group. It was suggested that the distributed materials be read and responded to within one week.

Children with Disabilities and Other Special Needs Initiatives Consulting Services Proposal

Louis Vismara introduced Dr. Marci Hanson from San Francisco State University and Dr. Tony Apolloni from Sonoma State University. Emily Nahat gave an overview of the purpose of enlisting the help consulting services. Tony Apolloni presented an overview of the scope of work of the California Institute on Human Services. The institute offers training and technical assistance related to serving children with disabilities. The three main foci of the institute are 1) 0-5 disability issues 2) child abuse prevention and domestic violence prevention and 3) general school improvement. Half of the institute's budget is used for staffing. The institute provides a full range of planning, training and technical assistance services. The institute's focus is on enabling those that it helps achieve their goals. This is a joint project between Sonoma State University and San Francisco State University. The work scope presented is for 17 months, beginning February 1st. It has three program components, strategic planning to help identify priorities, technical consultation between the committee and the State Commission, and technical assistance to county commissions. The institute believes that services for children with disabilities are best delivered in the context of the natural community or home.

Dr. Marci Hanson discussed how she became involved in this project. The proposal is designed to assist the committee in developing ways of gathering information to make the most effective decisions relating to children with disabilities and their families. There will be report provided by June consisting of basic data, basic concepts and key tenets. Following that report will be strategic planning addressing the question of what should the Commission do with respect to children with disabilities. There will be strategic meetings with many of the key stakeholders, many of whom are present today. This would be followed by technical consultation. The consultants would act as facilitators in this process. The third component would be technical assistance to county commissions as needed. The details to these components are in the handouts.

Dr. Hanson commented that the Advisory Committee on Diversity is expected to be actively involved in this proposal. The primary purpose of the stakeholders' meeting would be to identify gaps in the services provided and research being done for children with disabilities and their families.

Dr. Apolloni stated that the stakeholder would consist of representation from the Diversity Committee, County Commissions, major agencies that deliver services, and parents and parent organizations.

Rafael Lopez asked for information on how the proposal would address the concept of disabilities as it relates to communities of color. Drs. Hanson and Apolloni assured the committee that this was an important issue that would be addressed.

Mr. Lopez suggested the development of multi-lingual literature. He pointed out that translation is not sufficient, rather, documents should be developed originally in different languages. Emily Nahat stated that this is the type of issue that will be addressed at the stakeholders' meeting.

A discussion followed that addressed the issue of modifying the contract to reflect certain issues raised in this meeting. Those issues included 1) assuring that the stakeholders' meetings be reflective of diversity of the population being served, 2) the investigation of available literature, discovering whether or not it is appropriate for translation into other languages or if it would be better to develop original documents in other languages, 3) investigating how best to build on existing efforts in the community dealing with issues of children with disabilities and their families and 4) considering the feasibility of a parents only stakeholders meeting, and 5) the bringing together of different stakeholder groups.

Child Care Inclusion Specialists

Emily Nahat provided background on the Inclusion Specialist Project. The purpose of the project is to support families in locating child care and development services and sustaining placements for their children who have disabilities or special needs. Carmen Padilla presented funding options for this program.

Option A is to create a Request for Proposals or interagency agreement for project administration and allocation funds for the placement of local inclusion specialists. The project administrator would work with the California Children and Families Commission to devise an allocation formula for placing local inclusion specialists. They would develop the standards for practice, develop the curriculum and provide training to local inclusion specialists, offer networking opportunities and conduct activities to support consistent and quality services among local inclusion specialists, and ensure appropriate data are collected. The project administrator would also allocate CCFC funds to support local inclusion specialists. The local inclusion specialist would be responsible for delivering training to local early care and education providers; coordinating efforts among local agencies serving children with disabilities and special needs; and working with families to obtain early care and educational services for children with disabilities and special needs.

- **Method 1** would be to use the Child Care Resource and Referral Programs (RR) as the lead placement location for the local inclusion specialist. Pros to this method is that there would be a designated inclusion specialist assigned to each RR thereby establishing a statewide service. The RRs have the statutory charge to assist families in finding child care services. The cons to this method are that some county commissions have indicated that families with children with disabilities and special needs don't usually go to the RRs, they go to other agencies and that the concentration of RRs does not parallel the concentration of children with disabilities and other special needs.
- **Method 2** would be to depend on local collaborative decision regarding placement locations for local inclusion specialists. This would be done through collaboration among agencies, such as, the county commissions, county offices of education, regional centers, RRs, and CBOs. The pros for this method are the collaborative planning process to select a placement location would initiate a partnership between the entities needed to make this project successful, the location selected would be the place where families are likely to go for services in that area, and there would be a variety of evaluation models. The cons to this method include, no uniform placement of the service statewide and the training, uniform standards of practice and evaluation may be more challenging.

Option B would be to establish networks of regional inclusion coordinators at county offices of education and fund local inclusion specialists. This option would provide an integrated system using county offices

of education in a coordination and administrative role. One county office of education could serve as CCFC's project administrator to work as the lead with the other regional inclusion coordinators. They would devise an allocation formula for placing local inclusion specialists, develop the standards for practice, develop curriculum and provide training and technical assistance to local inclusion specialists, offer networking opportunities and conduct activities to support consistent and quality services among local inclusion specialists, and secure an independent evaluation, making sure appropriate data are collected. CCFC would provide matching funds to county commissions for local family inclusion specialists. The local inclusion specialist would then deliver inclusion training to local early care and education providers, coordinated efforts among local agencies serving children with disabilities, and work with families to obtain early care and education services for their children. The pros to this option include access for counties to highly qualified regional coordinator to navigate and improve service systems and to provide training for locally designated inclusion specialists who would then do the referral and work with the families. The regional coordinators would comprise a statewide system. The State Commission could ask that counties match funds to increase and spread the investment. There would be an evaluation of various models. Counties would have the discretion on where to place the local inclusion specialist. Evaluation would secure information on different types of programs. The cons to this option include, no consistency in the placement of the local inclusion specialist, and some counties may chose not to participate.

Option C would be to provide matching funds to county commissions to devise a local strategy to achieve project objectives. The pros for this option include, the option for counties to help families and train providers through existing agencies and entities, and the evaluation component would reflect the effectiveness based on how the program was implemented in the county. The cons to this option include, no statewide consistency in the program, no project administrator to develop program standards, training curriculum, provide technical assistance or manage data collection and evaluation. The initiative may be too diffuse to result in long term system improvement.

Option D would be to fund one of the options listed above on a limited pilot research basis rather than statewide. The pros to this option include, the State Commissions investment would be limited until evaluation data was available supporting a particular model and the evaluation would contribute to the national research base. The cons include time and money that could have been used as part of the total program, there would be a 3 to 5 year delay in implementing a statewide program, no uniform statewide program, a documented need would not be met, and the State Commission would still need to identify which model to implement and evaluate.

The committee members offered the following comments as part of the discussion on this agenda item:

Portia Choi spoke in support of a modified Option C: Support the requirement of matching funds from the county commissions, with the oversight of a state administrator (component from Option A). The project needs to be defined in result-based terms.

Kate Warren spoke in support of Option A-1: The Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) agencies are the recommended vehicle for implementing this project. To conduct the program through another system would create a separate and segregated organization for children with disabilities and their families. The Inclusion Project should help the current system (i.e., R&Rs) become more responsive and accountable to serving children with disabilities and other special needs. The RFA issued as part of Option A needs to stress inclusion and greater interagency collaboration.

Rafaela Frausto spoke in support of Option A-1: It is the mandate of R&Rs to serve all children. R&Rs are already conducting trainings in this arena (without any specifically designated funds). The R&Rs are more inclusive of family providers, not solely center-based providers.

Diane Visencio spoke in support of Option A-1: The Health Linkages projects and their child care health consultants would need to work closely together with the Inclusion Specialists.

Whit Hayslip spoke in support of Option A-1: It would be more confusing to families if the child care inclusion services were not offered through the R&Rs. The Inclusion Project would need to do outreach to

families to help them access their services. Use of the County Offices of Education would be too confusing (Option B), because they do not currently focus on child care referral services.

Patricia Phipps spoke in support of Option A: This option is in line with the mission of Prop 10, which is to build the statewide infrastructure.

Co-Chair Gutierrez addressed the need to fortify the system and services of the R&Rs. She expressed concerns about the lack of in-house expertise at the R&Rs on issues of children with disabilities for the development of standards, as well as training. Co-Chair Gutierrez stated that there are a number of agencies that can provide trainings.

Lou Vismara suggested that the one RFP with three components: referrals, community outreach, and training be issued.

Ray Galindo indicated that he did support the pilot project option (Option D) and would prefer not to have a state administrator (Option A), but does recognize the need for standards. He preferred a more regional approach and one not exclusively limited to R&Rs, but open to other community-based organizations.

Kate Warren expressed her concern about relationship between administration and the Inclusion Specialists. Inclusion Specialists should be employees of the local R&R; otherwise there are too many bosses involved.

Javier Guzman asked if the model would be adapted in various regions throughout the state depending on the number of children enrolled in the program. Mr. Guzman also asked if there has been any cost analysis done on any of the models. Emily Nahat informed the committee that Option A had an estimated cost of \$6M per year.

By consensus, the committee members voiced their support for Option A-1.

Public Comment

Pam Shaw suggested requiring written interagency agreements between participating agencies. That would include special education, regional centers, family resource centers, local planning councils and local commissions. She also suggested making the training unit based through community colleges. Ms. Shaw suggested making the local commissions invest funds into this program to help ensure program longevity.

Gene Smith asked for clarification on the idea of concentration of needs not paralleling the concentration of services. Carmen Padilla provided an example to address the question. She compared Los Angeles and Alpine as being two disparate populations with respect to needs and services. Mr. Smith pointed out that there is a difference between RR offices and RR locations. There are more RR locations than there are offices. Mr. Smith commented that none of the options adequately addressed the whole picture. He also commented that when his RR hires staff that speak languages other than English that the agency receives more calls for services. Mr. Smith expressed concerns about the matching funds idea. Some of the smaller counties may not have the matching funds. Mr. Smith noted that his RR facility has the capacity to train an inclusion specialist.

Other Diversity Initiatives

Nicole Kasabian provided a brief update on the work of the State Commission. On January 1st the Commission awarded a contract to an advertising agency for its paid media campaign. It is a \$90M, 3-year contract. The contract was awarded to TEAM GILD consisting of 4 media groups.

Javier Guzman cautioned against a cookie cutter approach to solving these issues in the central valley.

Ms. Kasabian described three major components of the public relations campaign:

- 1) paid media,

- 2) material distribution center for brochures, etc, and
- 3) community based organizations.

It is the community based organizations that will most likely address concerns raised by Mr. Guzman.

Martha Arevalo presented information on ethnic outreach campaigns. At the county level the Commission provides technical support and assistance on reaching diverse audiences. A general training was conducted to discuss California's diversity and present methods for the local commissions to conduct outreach at the local level. Given the success of these training sessions, the program has been extended. The first training session was the Asian and Pacific Islander outreach for county commissions, the second was the Latino outreach presentation and the third is planned for the 13th of February, which will focus on the African American community. The training helps local commissions identify who in their community is already using the practices that the commissions are trying to develop. The Asian and Pacific Islander training was conducted with the Korean American Family Service Center. The Latino outreach training was conducted with Univision. The third training will be conducted with Great Beginnings for Black Babies.

Co-Chair Gutierrez asked how this committee can assist this program. Ms. Arevalo informed the committee that its role in assuring that all decisions made by the State Commission consider impacts for children with disabilities and their families is an important one. Co-Chair Gutierrez suggested that the committee provide a liaison to maintain an active link between itself and the public relations program.

It was recognized that the American Indian population is under represented in this program. Martin Waukazoo commented that this issue needs to be handled sensitively.

Co-Chair Gutierrez asked that the public relations mailing list be updated to include committee members.

Patricia Phipps expressed concerns over assumptions made by the public relations program with respect to the knowledge of participants in the training programs. Ms. Arevalo assured the committee that the training sessions provided appropriate tools for the participants to proceed with community outreach. The upcoming training session will let participants know that when they begin their outreach campaigns, there will be technical assistance available.

Melanie Tervalon cautioned against moving too quickly when addressing issues of diversity.

Public Comment

Judy Chenoweth identified two public outreach projects involving local commissions. The first is the Civic Engagement Project. It is funded by 6-8 foundations involving 8 local commissions. The project is discussing outreach into under represented communities. The second project is being conducted by the foundation consortium with four local commissions. One way of describing this work is outreach, another is public engagement and another is called inclusive government. All are about ways of involving communities in significant and ongoing ways in the decision making around supports and services for young children.

Cheri Schoenborn, State Department of Developmental Services, offered words of appreciation for the work done by the committee. Ms. Schoenborn cautioned that the committee not forget about the 0-3 population. She urged the committee to build on existing programs.

Nicole Kasabian informed the committee that State Commission staff is putting together a communication action guide.

Sharon Tettegah asked about specifics of the training sessions, specifically, what strategies are employed to help participants understand more about cultural nuances. Ms. Arevalo informed the committee that the strategies are fairly general at this point. The key component was identified as being community involvement. Identifying who in the community needs to be involved in a particular campaign.

Melanie Tervalon reiterated the point that the issue of cultural diversity is very complex and multi-layered.

Louis Vismara suggested a body of two or three people that could address the details being raised by the consultants. Those individuals would be responsible for looking at these details and reporting back to the committee.

Ms. Kasabian indicated that she would make recommendations on establishing a media liaison(s) to the media efforts.

Committee Member Reports and Announcements

Dianne Visencio asked for a status report on the feedback synthesis regarding the New Parent Kit discussed at the last meeting. Jane Henderson informed the committee that staff is in the process of synthesizing responses. The process should be complete in approximately one week. Staff has received very positive feedback from the pilot phase in terms of parents' knowledge and behavioral change.

Expect to receive a concept paper on both the household and public opinion surveys through e-mail. Please respond to Elias Lopez (with copies to Barbara Marquez).

The next meeting will be held on March 29th, 2001. The retreat will be held April 30th-May 1st.

Barbara Marquez summarized some of the key concepts developed during this meeting.

Co-Chair Gutierrez announced that CCFC is supporting the California Policymakers Institute on Health, Race, Poverty and California's future to be held March 22-23 in Santa Monica.

Adjournment

The February 7th, 2001, meeting of the California Children and Families Commission Advisory Committee on Diversity adjourned at 4:00 p.m.